UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,283	11/06/2006	Kassem Ghorayeb	94.0052	3037
Danita J.M. Ma	7590 05/13/200 iseles	EXAMINER		
Schlumberger Technology Corporation 5599 San Felipe suite 400 Houston, TX 77056-2722			ALHIJA, SAIF A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2128	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Commence	10/586,283	GHORAYEB ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	SAIF A. ALHIJA	2128		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D/ - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 A</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o				
Application Papers				
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 17 July 2006 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to l drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

Art Unit: 2128

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4 have been presented for examination.

Claim 5 has been cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2 April 2009 has been entered.

NON-PRIOR ART ARGUMENTS

- i) Following Applicants amendments the recitation of the explicit use of a computer in the claim language overcomes the previously presented 101 rejection in view of current office policy. Therefore the 101 rejection is **WITHDRAWN**.
 - ii) Following Applicants amendments and arguments the 112 rejections are WITHDRAWN.

PRIOR ART ARGUMENTS

iii) Following Applicants amendments the previous rejection is withdrawn in view of the 103 rejection presented below.

EXAMINERS NOTES

- iv) Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.
- v) The Examiner respectfully requests, in the event the Applicants choose to amend or add new claims, that such claims and their limitations be directly mapped to the specification, which provides support for the subject matter. This will assist in expediting compact prosecution.

Art Unit: 2128

vi) Further, the Examiner respectfully encourages Applicants to direct the specificity of their response with regards to this office action to the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims as presented. This will avoid issues that would delay prosecution such as limitations not explicitly presented in the claims, intended use statements that carry no patentable weight, mere allegations of patentability, and novelty that is not clearly expressed.

vii) The Examiner also respectfully requests Applicants, in the event they choose to amend, to supply a clean version of the presented claims in addition to the marked-up copy in order to avoid potential inaccuracies with the version of the claims that would be examined.

PRIORITY

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). Priority date is 23 November 2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2128

4. Claim(s) 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Briens et al. "Application of

Sequential Staging of Tasks to Petroleum Reservoir Modeling", hereafter B in view of Watts U.S. Patent No.

6108608, hereafter W.

Regarding Claim 1:

B discloses A method of controlling the coupling of multiplatform reservoir and network simulators

comprising:

synchronizing the advancement through time of the reservoir and network simulators executing on a

computer; (B. Page 431, left column, second to last paragraph, "synchronization of parallel events")

performing a production operation based on simulations of the reservoir and network simulators of a

reservoir, the simulations performed on the computer using the converted hydrocarbon fluid streams. (B. Page 428,

top right, production rates. Equation 1) (B. Introduction, paragraph 1, hydrocarbon and non-hydrocarbon

components)

B does not disclose translating each of a plurality of hydrocarbon fluid streams to a common fluid model

of a controller by converting pseudo components of each of the plurality of hydrocarbon fluid streams to a super set

of pseudocomponents used in the reservoir and network simulators executing on a computer.

However W discloses translating each of a plurality of hydrocarbon fluid streams to a common fluid model

of a controller by converting pseudo components of each of the plurality of hydrocarbon fluid streams to a super set

of pseudocomponents used in the reservoir and network simulators executing on a computer. (W. Abstract)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the

pseudocomponent aspect of multi component fluid flow as discussed in W for the simulation of B since the

pseudocomponent aspect of W is "particularly useful in estimating properties and/or behavior of fluids

contained in hydrocarbon-bearing, subterranean formations or in hydrocarbon processing facilities." (W.

Column 1, Lines 13-16)

Regarding Claim 2:

See rejection of claim 1.

Art Unit: 2128

Regarding Claim 3:

The reference discloses The controller of claim 2 additionally comprising means for apportioning global

production and injection constraints between simulation tasks of the reservoir and network simulators. (B. Page 428,

top right, production/injection)

Regarding Claim 4:

The reference discloses The controller of claim 3 additionally comprising means for balancing reservoir

and surface networks. (B. Introduction, paragraph 2, flow/material balancing. Page 432, left column, last two

paragraphs, load balancing)

Conclusion

5. All Claims are rejected.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be

directed to SAIF A. ALHIJA whose telephone number is (571)272-8635. The examiner can normally be reached on

M-F, 11:00-7:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah

can be reached on (571) 272-22792279. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. Informal or draft communication, please label PROPOSED or DRAFT,

can be additionally sent to the Examiners fax phone number, (571) 273-8635.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information

Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR

or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the

Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SAA

Art Unit: 2128

May 8, 2009

/Hugh Jones/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2128